

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
October 23, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting on October 23, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Draft Study Plan CUL.S.1 – Cultural Resources Inventory

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – September 25, 2001 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting

A summary of the September 25, 2001 Cultural Resources Work Group meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #C28:	Develop draft Memorandum of Understanding between DWR, DPR and the Tribes explaining Tribal involvement.
Status:	An update on the status of the MOU is included in this agenda.
Action Item #C29:	Distribute draft Study Plan to the Cultural Resources Work Group prior to their next meeting.
Status:	A draft Study Plan was distributed to the Cultural Resources Work Group for discussion at this meeting.

Memorandum of Understanding Progress Update

Janis Offermann reported that DWR, members of the consulting team, and representatives of the recognized tribes met on October 1, 2001 to discuss a working draft of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU outlines protocols for working with tribal members while conducting cultural resources studies during the relicensing process. She explained that minor revisions were made to the MOU at the meeting and then distributed to the tribes for their further review and comment. Tribal representatives met on October 14, 2001 to discuss the MOU and Janis reported that the consulting team and DWR are awaiting the outcome of that meeting. She added that an MOU regarding the execution of fluctuation zone studies was also discussed at the October 1st meeting, as was the tribal request to develop a detailed set of protocols for addressing cultural resources issues after conclusion of the relicensing effort.

One participant expressed concern that certain key tribal representatives had not been invited to the October 1, meeting. Janis Offermann acknowledged this and added that the appropriate representatives would be invited to future meetings.

Fluctuation Zone Task Force Update

Janis Offermann reported that agreements between Mooretown Rancheria and DWR to hire tribal members for cultural resources studies were still in negotiation. Adrian Praetzellis of the consulting team added that significant progress had been made at a recent meeting and it was likely that the detailed agreements would be ready soon.

The group discussed the existence and availability of the DPR archaeological catalog from the dam construction. Janis Offermann responded that she assumed a catalog of collected items existed but that she wasn't sure. She also wasn't certain that, if it does exist, it would be available to the public. Janis was then asked about the list of NAGPRA remains held by DPR. She responded that such a list does exist and that it is available.

The Facilitator asked if there was a protocol for accessing potentially confidential records from DPR. Leslie Steidl offered to check with Betty Smart, DPR's collections curator, and report back to the Cultural Resources Work Group on the availability of DPR records and the process for accessing them. Adrian Praetzellis added that NAGPRA records from the dam construction were available. Janis agreed to provide the inventory of NAGPRA materials developed by DPR to the Cultural Resources Work Group before their next meeting.

There was some concern that artifacts may have been stored, or in some cases loaned out, to a variety of locations and institutions and may not all be housed in West Sacramento. One participant mentioned a collection of native baskets displayed at the Oroville City Hall. Another participant mentioned that local tribal history mentions artifacts being distributed to colleges in Northern California. Helen McCarthy of the Consulting Team responded that although it is not possible to know where every artifact is, there is compelling evidence that the collections from the dam construction are in West Sacramento. She also mentioned that any institution that received artifacts from this area should have notified local tribes in writing. The group discussed the possibility that artifacts from the area, not associated with dam construction, may have been moved to other locations without local tribal consent or proper documentation. Michael Delacorte of the Consulting Team reminded participants that a comprehensive inventory of the artifacts associated with the construction of the dam is included in the study plans being considered by the Cultural Resources Work Group.

Study Plan Review

At their previous meeting the Consulting Team was tasked with drafting a study plan for Cultural Resources Issue Sheet #1. The product of the consulting team's efforts, Study CUL.S.1 – Cultural Resources Inventory, was distributed to participants prior to this meeting and is appended to this summary as Attachment 4.

Steve Heipel of DWR provided the Cultural Resource Work Group with an overview of the draft study plan. He mentioned that the study plan was the last step in a process that started with identifying issues and proceeded through the development of issue sheets. He added that this study plan helped answer the questions "What's out there?" and "Where is it?" and would provide the information foundation to the work to be covered by Issue Sheets 2, 3 and 4.

Steve mentioned that this Study CUL.S.1 would include an assessment of background research including archeological and historic-era resources, ethnographical and ethnohistorical research, as well as geomorphic and biologic components. Study CUL.S.1 also includes close consultation with tribal representatives and field surveys as required. The resulting reports generated by the Study CUL.S.1 would include:

- Archaeological Resources Inventory
- Historic-Era Resources Inventory
- Ethnographic Context, Ethnohistoric Background, and Traditional Cultural Properties Inventory

One participant asked if the data in the existing information would be assessed for accuracy. She stated that there is concern within the tribal community that information about cultural resources generated during the dam construction may not be entirely accurate. Steve responded that every effort would be made to assure the accuracy of the information gathered. In the case of existing information, researchers will consider the source of the information to help evaluate data accuracy.

One participant asked about efforts to collect and verify data from tribes that were exterminated prior to the dam's construction. In this case there would be no direct tribal history to access. She added that this should include an assessment of significant Chinese cultural resources in the region. Steve responded that to the degree it is possible, information regarding all the artifacts collected during the construction of the dam would be gathered. He added that gathering and verifying information from artifacts collected prior to the dam to the gold rush might be more difficult. Steve mentioned that outreach to a variety of groups had been made, however there was no longer a large Chinese population in the area. In the case where individual groups cannot be contacted, efforts will be made to gather resource information from other sources.

One participant asked if the research in this study would include an assessment of locations eligible for inclusion in the Register of Historic Places. He added that a number of sites associated with the construction of the Oroville Facilities might become eligible for inclusion on the list during the new license period. Steve responded that an assessment would be made. Adrian added that the Cultural Resources Work Group would need to be aware of any sites that may become eligible for the Register including those associated with the Oroville Facilities.

One participant asked if an assessment of native plants would be included in the inventory in the Study Plan. The Facilitator responded that the Environmental Work Group was preparing work plans that would include an inventory of native plants. She added that the Environmental Work Group is aware of the need for coordination with the Cultural Resources Work Group to make sure that an inventory of culturally significant plants would be included.

Participants discussed the status of the remaining Cultural Resources Study Plans. The remaining Study Plans will be prepared by the Consulting Team and distributed to participants one week prior to their next meeting. Participants agreed to submit additional comments on Study Plan CUL.S.1 to Janis Offermann by November 6, 2001.

Other Issues

The Facilitator reminded participants that two public scoping meetings associated with the relicensing effort would be held on October 29 and 30, 2001, in Oroville and Sacramento, respectively. The meetings are intended to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on Scoping Document 1. She explained that the NEPA process requires the meetings, and each would include an informational open house, formal presentations by DWR and FERC, and a public comment period. Information on the scoping meetings can be viewed on the relicensing web site at <http://OrovilleRelicensing.water.ca.gov>.

The Facilitator also mentioned that a site visit of selected Oroville Facilities would be held during the day on October 29 and interested participants needed to let her know that they wished to attend. Several members of the Cultural Resources Work Group expressed an interest in attending the site visit and were recorded on the flip chart notes.

Agenda Items for Next Meeting

The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed that the following items should be on the November 27, 2001 meeting agenda:

- SHPO presentation
- Update on Fluctuation Zone studies
- Study plan development update

Next Meeting

The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed to meet:

Date: Tuesday, November 27, 2001
Time: 5:30 to 9:30 p.m.
Location: To be announced.

The Cultural Resource Work Group meeting adjourned at 9 p.m.

Agreements Made

1. The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed to move the presentation on SHPO to their next meeting.
2. The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed to task DWR staff and the consulting team with developing draft study plans for review at the next Cultural Resources Work Group meeting.
3. The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed to review draft Study Plan CUL.S.1 and provide comment to Janis Offermann of DWR by November 6, 2001.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Cultural Resources Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

Action Item #C30: Provide an inventory of artifacts removed during dam construction or information on accessing that information.
Responsible: DWR Staff/Consulting Team/Leslie Steidl
Due Date: November 27, 2001

Action Item #C31: Provide comments on CUL.S.1 Study Plan to Janis Offermann.
Responsible: Work Group Participants
Due Date: November 6, 2001

Action Item #C32: Provide draft study plans for Issue Sheets CR 2, 3 and 4 to the Cultural Resource Work Group prior to their next meeting for review.
Responsible: DWR Staff/Consulting Team
Due Date: November 20, 2001